Questions from EPA 4/30/14

-These questions were compiled by Erin Foresman and Stephanie Skophammer (EPA). To summarize, we are asking where we can find certain information in the document. This is not an exhaustive list.

1. **Concrete Batch Plants** Page 3-29, line 34. Will the concrete batch plants be removed when they are done using them? Where can we find more information about the concrete batch plants - where will the materials be sourced from?
2. **Yolo Bypass CM2** -Page 3-49, lines 15-37. Why isn't CM2 mentioned in the discussion about the reserve system (CM4)? It says on p. 3-45 line 26 that it will be in the reserve system. What would happen to the Yolo Bypass restoration areas if they are not in the reserve system established by CM2? How will they be managed and by whom?
    a. -Page 3-122. Why aren't there any citations for lines 15 and 16?
    b. -p.3-122 How does CM2 compare to NMFS 2009 BIOP Yolo bypass requirements? Is there a more detailed description of the BIOP within the document? How many acres of restoration are included in CM2- is it 8,000 or less or more? Where does the water to flood the bypass come from? How often would it be flooded- p.6-49 says it won't be flooded very often compared to the No Action? P. 11-278 gives a lot of information about this that should be in Ch 3. Are these details described in the HCP (if so can page numbers be provided?).
    c. -p. 3-123 line 33-38 Which of these components are already moving forward in the yolo bypass EIS? Are they defined in that EIS but implemented here in the BDCP?
3. Pg. 3-26 Where is there a description in the EIS of the state-of-the-art fish screens?
4. P. 3-50 this is the first place in the EIS that the "BDCP Implementation Office" is mentioned. Where in the document is a description of this entity?
5. P.3-33 this is the first place in the document that the change for the compliance point is mentioned. Where can we find more details about what this would entail?
6. P.3-199 why is cold water pool storage criteria not applicable to other Scenarios?
7. P.3-202 line 19-21 Scenario H could be implemented with any project alternative- is this true in reverse as well? (any scenario- any alternative?) how does this relate to p. 3-4 footnote 5 that the HCP can be revised on the practicability of the alternatives tentatively rejected therein?
8. **Need to know where in the document is the analysis for Urban Demands:** Page 5-64 The NAA provides water to increasing urban demands. Are urban demands estimated or modeled and described in a need analysis somewhere in the appendices? Increases and decreases (line 37) in water demand are referred to often. What information or equation (and terms) determines increase or decrease in water demand?
    a. I could not find this in the growth inducement chapter where it is referenced. A demand analysis would at least be referenced in Ch 2 as well. What would a full expansion of water rights (p. 5-57) look like?
    b. p. 30-15 references 20x2020 but it is not incorporated into the BDCP, correct?
9. Why is No Action Alternative not split out into north of delta and south of delta exports in figure 5-17?
10. P.7-42 land use remains constant at year 2000. Where is the discussion about the compatibility with water demand analysis?
11. Page 8-195, lines 27 to 38, "Sacramento River at Emmaton is an exception where sea level rise and increased water demands combine to cause increases in electrical conductivity. Check averaging period in the appendix." I saw that the years are all averaged together but want to discuss it further with someone familiar with the analysis. Salinity intrusion is modeled to cause

an adverse effect on Delta WQ in the No Action Alternative.

12. 8-149 Chloride Analysis – Is there someone I can discuss the chloride analysis with at DWR or one of the consulting organizations? I understand that the mass balance and EC-Chloride relationship method were used to estimate chloride concentrations at compliance points for the 16-year hydrologic modeling period. The text in this section explains that the mass-balance modeling results were compared to objectives based on averaging periods appropriate to beneficial use. It would be helpful to know the averaging periods. They are usually precisely identified in the objective. Were the objective averaging periods used? Is that information in an appendix or technical memorandum? I am confused about the way results are shown in the appendix which puts all the 16-years together and reports an average concentration or % change in compliance/exceedance for "ALL" the 16 years and for the 5 "DROUGHT" years. Are all the years averaged together? Are there data tables that show the estimated compliance and exceedance concentrations? Can we see them by year and see how many exceedances predicted in each year of the 16 year period? Can this be done for the EC analysis too? If the info is already in the document, where is it?
13. Page 8-212, lines 4-13, was residence time considered relative to exposure to pesticides and other contaminants in the system? If so, how was that done and where is that description in the EIS?
14. General modeling question. We see that Cl and EC are commonly exceeded. **How does the CALSIM model decide which WQ elements can be violated and which ones cannot?** Why are EC and Cl- chronically exceeded while Delta Outflow objective and diversion demands are met?
15. Is there is a comparison of all the alternatives? I see in Appendix 8G that alternatives are compared to NAA and Existing Conditions using percent exceedance and averaged concentrations. Can we compare all alternatives using charts with the applicable objectives represented as horizontal lines? Could this be done for EC and other WQ elements too?
16. P.8-4 line 11-13 CM1 is modeled with effects of CM4 as a complete package so there is no way to "disentangle the hydrodynamic effects" of restoration from the tunnels. Can we have a confirmation that this is true for Ch 11 as well? P.11-15 line 23-24 alludes to it.
17. P.11-55 table 11-4 how does this table encompass h1-h4?
18. P. 11-1322 discussions regarding storage will commence in the Sec 7 consultation, can someone explain what this is?
19. How were programmatic inputs added to CM1 to produce project-level outputs? –p. 11-16
20. What is the status of the summary tables for Ch 11?
21. We may need to do a walk-through of how the migration impact determination for winter-run chinook was made, it is something that we are unable to follow. AQUA-42 –p. 11-1328

<u>Transportation Questions</u>

*The document references the FY 2008-2009 to FY 2011-2012 Metropolitan Transportation Commission TIP. Has MTC approved a more recent TIP?

*In the analysis of impacts to pavement conditions, was consideration given to roads that have pavement that is currently in good condition but may deteriorate as a result of the increased truck traffic resulting from the project? If not, why not?

*In the analysis of LOS conditions resulting from the various alternatives, why do BPBG conditions differ between the alternatives? For example, under alternative 1a, the BPBG count of segments exceeding LOS standards is 23, but under 1b, 1c, etc, the count is 19. Are slightly different road networks being analyzed for the different alternatives?

*The DEIS states that the number of vehicles generated by construction activities would be lower for Alternatives 3 and 5 than for Alternative 1a, but they lead to the same number of LOS exceedances – why? Same question about impacts to pavement conditions.